



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/067,680	02/04/2002	Tsung-Pei Chiang	B-4493 619511-2	7127
7590 Richard P. Berg, Esq. c/o LADAS & PARRY Suite 2100 5670 Wilshire Boulevard Los Angeles, CA 90036-5679			EXAMINER NGUYEN, KEVIN M	
			ART UNIT 2629	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 02/18/2009	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES

Ex parte TSUNG-PEI CHIANG and CHUN-CHIN TSENG

Appeal 2008-6083
Application 10/067,680
Technology Center 2600

Decided:¹February 18, 2009

Before JOSEPH F. RUGGIERO, ROBERT E. NAPPI, and KARL D.
EASTHOM, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

NAPPI, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

DECISION ON APPEAL

This is a decision on appeal under 35 U.S.C. § 6(b) of the final
rejection of claims 12, 13, and 16.

We affirm the Examiner's rejections of these claims.

¹ The two-month time period for filing an appeal or commencing a civil
action, as recited in 37 CFR§ 1.304, begins to run from the decided date
shown on this page of the decision. The time period does not run from the
Mail Date (paper delivery) or Notification Date (electronic delivery).

INVENTION

The invention is directed towards a method of driving a Thin Film Transistor array that saves power by applying different driving modes to a display panel at graphic and non-graphic regions. See page 1 of Appellants' Specification. Claim 12 is representative of the invention and reproduced below:

12. A driving method for a Thin Film Transistor array, capable of saving power, comprising:
dividing a Thin Film Transistor array frame into a first zone and a second zone, the first zone grouped into a graphic region and the second zone grouped into a non-graphic region; and
driving the first and second zones respectively with line inversion and frame inversion.

REFERENCES

An	US 6,335,719 B1	Jan. 1, 2002
Moriyama	US 6,624,801 B2	Sep. 23, 2003 (filed Feb. 26, 2001)

REJECTIONS AT ISSUE

The Examiner has rejected claim 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Moriyama. The Examiner's rejection is on page 3 of the Answer².

² Throughout the opinion, we make reference to the Answer, mailed May 30, 2007, for the respective details thereof.

The Examiner has rejected claims 13 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moriyama in view of An. The Examiner's rejection is on pages 3 through 5 of the Answer.

ISSUE

Appellants argue on page 3 and 4 of the Brief³ that the Examiner's rejection of claim 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) is in error. Appellants assert that Moriyama does not disclose a display where the graphic region is driven with line inversion and that the non-graphic region is driven with frame inversion as recited in claim 12. Rather, Appellants assert that Moriyama teaches a display with two regions, but that they are driven in the opposite manner (i.e. graphic region with frame inversion, non-graphic with line inversion). Brief 4.

Appellants argue on page 4 of the Brief that the Examiner's rejection of claim 13 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(e) is in error. Appellants' arguments rely upon the rationale presented with respect to claim 12.

Thus, Appellants' contentions present us with the issue: did the Examiner err in finding that Moriyama discloses a display where the graphic region is driven with line inversion and the non-graphic region is driven with frame inversion as claimed?

PRINCIPLES OF LAW

In analyzing the scope of the claim, Office personnel must rely on Appellant's disclosure to properly determine the meaning of the terms used

in the claims. *Markman v. Westview Instruments, Inc.*, 52 F.3d 967, 980 (Fed. Cir. 1995). “[I]nterpreting what is *meant* by a word *in* a claim is not to be confused with adding an extraneous limitation appearing in the specification, which is improper.” (Emphasis original) *In re Cruciferous Sprout Litigation*, 301 F.3d 1343, 1348 (Fed. Cir. 2002) (citations and quotations omitted).

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. Moriyama teaches a method of driving a display apparatus which can reduce power. The display area is divided into sections, and each section is scanned at a different interval. Abstract.
2. Moriyama teaches that the display area may be sectioned in several configurations. In the embodiment shown in Figure 4, the display area is divided into two sections. In the embodiment shown in Figure 6 the display area is divided into three sections.
3. Moriyama describes the embodiment of Figure 4 as including two display regions. The first region (item 31) is described as having a picture with a small picture change and may for example contain a display of date, hour, and battery remaining. The second region (item 32) is described as having “a usual picture” and may for example be an antenna indication or a white screen. The second region is driven at a reduced rate. Col. 9, l. 57- col. 10 l. 3.

³ Throughout the opinion, we make reference to the Brief, received January 22, 2007 for the respective details thereof.

4. Moriyama teaches that one way to further decrease power consumption is to employ row line inversion (line inversion) in the first region (item 31) and employ frame inversion in the second region (item 32). Col. 6, ll. 32-36.
5. Moriyama's embodiment of Figure 6 includes three display regions. The first and third regions (item 31, and 33) are described as having black portions at the top and bottom of a screen and are driven at a reduced rate. The second region (item 32) is described as the region containing information such as a television broadcast and as such is driven at the usual rate. Col. 18, ll. 40-53.

ANALYSIS

Appellants' arguments have not persuaded us that the Examiner erred in finding that Moriyama discloses a display where the graphic region is driven with line inversion and that the non-graphic region is driven with frame inversion as claimed. Claim 12 recites dividing an array into "a first zone and a second zone, the first zone grouped into a graphic region and the second zone grouped into a non graphic region." Appellants' Specification does not provide a definition of the term graphic, nor has Appellants' proffered a definition. As such we construe the term to mean some form of symbolic representation of information. We note that this is consistent with Appellants' Specification which seems to suggest, on page 3, lines 19-21 that graphic is different than video. Further, we construe non-graphics to mean other display information that is not graphic, e.g. no display, or video.

Claim 12 further recites "driving the first and second zones respectively with line inversion and frame inversion." Thus, the scope of

claim 12 includes that the graphic zone, which contains some form of symbolic information but not video, is driven with line inversion and the non-graphics zone is driven with frame inversion.

The Examiner has found on page 3 of the Answer that Moriyama teaches row inversion is used for the first region (item 31) and that frame inversion is used for the second region (item 32). We find ample evidence to support the Examiner's findings. Fact 4. Appellants' arguments do not dispute this finding by the Examiner, but assert that the rejection is in error as the first region item 31 is a non-graphic region, which is one of the black portions of the screen. Brief 3. While we concur with Appellants that in the embodiment of Moriyama's Figure 6, region 31 is a non-graphic region, we do not consider this fact to show error in the Examiner's rejection.⁴ We consider Moriyama's teaching of driving the first region using line inversion to apply to the embodiment of Figure 4, (note the discussion of inversion only discusses two regions as in Figure 4, and not three as in Figure 6). In the Figure 4 embodiment, zone 31 contains a display of time and battery life. Fact 3. We consider both of these types of displays to be graphical representations as they provide symbolic information (which is not video). Further, in the Figure 4 embodiment, zone 32 which is driven using frame inversion, contains a display such as a white screen (i.e. no display information) (Fact 3) and as such is a non-graphic region. Accordingly, Appellant's arguments have not persuaded us of error in the Examiner's

⁴ We additionally note that Appellants' argument that region 32 of the Figure 6 embodiment equates to the claimed graphical region is not persuasive. Moriyama discloses that region 32 in Figure 6 is a television signal or movie (Fact 5), i.e. video. As discussed *supra*, based upon Appellants' Specification, video is not graphical.

rejection of claim 12 as we find that Moriyama discloses a display where the graphic region is driven with line inversion and the non-graphic region is driven with frame inversion as claimed.

Appellants' arguments, directed to the Examiner's rejection of claims 13 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rely upon the same arguments as presented with respect to claim 12. Accordingly, we sustain the Examiner's rejection of claims 13 and 16 for the reasons discussed with respect to claim 12.

ORDER

The decision of the Examiner to reject claims 12, 13 and 16 is affirmed.

Appeal 2008-6083
Application 10/067,680

No time period for taking any subsequent action in connection with this appeal may be extended under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a)(1)(iv).

AFFIRMED

ELD

RICHARD P. BERG, ESQ.
C/O LADAS & PARRY
SUITE 2100
5670 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD
LOS ANGELES, CA 90036-5679